

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated November 6, 2006. Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 18-20 and 23-28 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 18 and 23 are in independent form. Claims 1, 4, 7, 18 and 23 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The specification has been amended to conform the Summary of Invention section to the amended claims.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his indication that Claims 1-2, 4-7, 18-20 and 23-28 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, set forth below.

Claims 1-2, 4-7, 18-20 and 23-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, the Office Action states on page 3 that “Claims 1, 18 and 23 as amended recite that, in response to an error, ‘said controller issues to said image generator an order to execute an initialization or a reset whereas said controller does not issue to said image forming unit an order to execute an initialization or a reset.’ However, the Specification as originally filed does not appear to describe the operation of the recited apparatus such that it recovers from an error by initializing or resetting only the former but not the latter.”

As shown above, Applicant has amended independent Claims 1, 18 and 23 in terms that more clearly define what he regards as his invention. In particular, Applicant has amended the claims to delete reference to an “initialization.” Applicant respectfully submits that the specification clearly describes the above-mentioned feature of Claims 1, 18 and 23. In

particular, the specification states, on page 28, lines 13-18, that when the reset process of the image input/output controller 3 is notified of an initiation of a restart, it sends a RESET signal to the formatter 4 (i.e., the image generator). Further, on page 29 lines 9-15, the specification explains that the controller “sends a reset signal to the formatter 4. Thus, only the formatter 4 is initialized...” (see also, Figure 7 and page 20, lines 11-22). Thus, Applicant submits that it is clear from the specification that when the controller detects an error, it issues to the image generator an order to execute a reset, but does not issue to the image forming unit an order to reset .

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

This Amendment After Final Action is believed clearly to place this application in condition for allowance and, therefore, its entry is believed proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment After Final Action, as an earnest effort to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact Applicant’s undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant’s respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jennifer A. Reda/
Jennifer A. Reda
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 57,840

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 610060v1